A BIOBIBLIOGRAPHICAL HANDBOOK OF BULGARIAN AUTHORS

by

Mateja Matejic
Elena Dimitrova
Krustyu Kuyumdzhiev
Docho Lekov
Ivan Sarandev

Edited by

Karen L. Black

Translated by

Predrag Matejic

Slavica Publishers, Inc.

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

FOR USE IN
READING ROOM ONLY

UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS LIBRARY
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
SLAVIC

Bulg.

A BIOBIBLIOGRAPHICAL HANDBOOK OF BULGARIAN AUTHORS

A BIOBIBLIOGRAPHICAL HANDBOOK OF BULGARIAN AUTHORS

by

Mateja Matejic
Elena Dimitrova
Krustyu Kuyumdzhiev
Docho Lekov
Ivan Sarandev

Edited by

Karen L. Black

Translated by

Predrag Matejic

Slavica Publishers, Inc.

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

For a complete list of books from Slavica Publishers, with prices and ordering information, write to:
Slavica Publishers, Inc.
P.O. Box 14388
Columbus, Ohio 43214

ISBN: 0-89357-091-5.

Statements of fact or opinion are the responsibility of each individual author, and do not necessarily reflect the position of the publisher, editor, or the other authors, who assume no responsibility for such statements.

Copyright © 1981 by Slavica Publishers, Inc. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

016.89181
B52

Bulgarian Ref.
(Slavic)

Dedicated
to

THE BULGARIAN PEOPLE

on the
1300th anniversary
of the first
Bulgarian state.

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE PUBLISHER 11
TRANSLATOR'S FOREWORD 13
TRANSLITERATION 15
NOTE ON THE AUTHORS 17
INTRODUCTION 19
OLD BULGARIAN (OLD SLAVONIC) LITERATURE 37
Konstantin (Kiril) 39
Methodius 46
Kliment Okhridski 51
Chernorizets Khrabur 55
Ioan Exarch 57
Konstantin Preslavski 60
Kozma Presbyter 64
Evtimiy 66
Grigoriy Tsamblak 70
Konstantin of Kostenitsa 73
Vladislav the Grammarian 76
THE PERIOD OF NATIONAL REAWAKENING 79
Paisiy Hilendarski 81
Sofroniy Vrachanski 84
Petur Beron 87
Neofit Rilski 90
Neofit Khilendarski Bozveli 93
Nayden Gerov 96
Dobri Chintulov 99
Georgi Rakovski 102
Petko R. Slaveykov 106
Dobri Voynikov 111

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Vasil Drumev 113
Iliya Bluskov 117
Grigor Purlichev 119
Rayko (Ksenofont) Yoanov Zhinzifov 121
Nesho Bonchev 124
Lyuben Karavelov 126
Khristo Botev 132
FROM THE LIBERATION TO WORLD WAR I 139
Ivan Vazov 141
Zakhari Stoyanov 150
Mikhalaki Georgiev 154
Stoyan Mikhaylovski 156
Aleko Konstantinov 160
T. G. Vlaykov 164
Pencho P. Slaveykov 167
G. P. Stamatov 172
Anton Strashimirov 174
Kiril Khristov 177
Elin Pelin 180
P. K. Yavorov 185
Dimcho Debelyanov 188
Geo Milev 192
FROM WORLD WAR I TO THE BULGARIAN SOCIALIST REVOLUTION 195
S. L. Kostov 197
Yordan Yovkov 200
Nikolay Liliev 205
Khristo Yasenov 208
Stoyan Zagorchinov 210

Elizaveta Bagryana 214
Asen Raztsvetnikov 218
Khristo Smirnenski 221
Angel Karaliychev 225
Nikola Furnadzhiev 228
Nikola Vaptsarov 231
CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE 235
Lyudmil Stoyanov 237
Dora Gabe 240
Dimitur Talev 243
Svetoslav Minkov 246
Kamen Zidarov 250
Khristo Radevski 253
Orlin Vasilev 256
Iliya Volen 258
Atanas Dalchev 260
Georgi Karaslavov 263
Mladen Isaev 266
Emiliyan Stanev 268
Stoyan Tsenov Daskalov 273
Dimitur Dimov 275
Andrey Gulyashki 278
Kamen Kalchev 280
Pavel Vezhinov 282
Venko Markovski 284
Emil Manov 286
Veselin Andreev 289
Aleksandur Gerov 291
Bogomil Raynov 294
Nikolay Khaytov 297

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Veselin Khanchev 300
Valeri Petrov 303
Dimitur Metodiev 306
Blaga Dimitrova 308
Bozhidar Bozhilov 311
Ivaylo Petrov 314
Pavel Matev 317
Georgi Dzhagarov 320
Yordan Radichkov 322
Peno Penev 325
Slav Khr. Karaslavov 327
Lyubomir Levchev 330
TRANSLATOR'S NOTES 333
INDEX OF ABBREVIATIONS 335

FROM THE PUBLISHER

On the 1300th anniversary of the first Bulgarian state, it gives Slavica great pleasure to publish a work which is the result of cooperation between Bulgarian and American scholars. The text was written by one American and four Bulgarians; it was translated by an American who did his postgraduate work in Bulgaria, and was edited by another American.

Because of the composite nature of the work, the reader will find some differences from section to section in the approach to the material. In particular, in the sections authored by Bulgarians, the Western reader will find considerably more emphasis upon political and social information and explanations than is usual in the West, and of course the point of view and even the phraseology are different from those current in the West. We hope that our readers will regard this as an opportunity not only to learn about the Bulgarian writers discussed, but also as a chance to see a different approach to literature, the one that is most common in Eastern Europe and the USSR today. The opinions expressed by the writers of this book do not necessarily coincide with those of the publisher or the editor or the translator, but we feel that it is worthwhile to make a different viewpoint available to our readers.

We would ask our readers to note the following: first, the bibliography and list of translations are up to date approximately to early 1977, although the publisher has made a few additions from later years where the information was known. Various problems connected with translation and editing, as well as waiting for the return of proofs, have delayed publication until early 1982. In spite of waiting two years for an answer from the Bulgarian authors, we never did receive any corrections to the proofs or indication that they were ever read, and thus certain questions remained unanswered. The Editor has noted many of these inconsistencies at the relevant places. Since trying to update the bibliographies would have involved considerable time and much rewriting and resetting of the text, with no assurance that we would actually receive any material, given the failure to read proofs, Slavica decided to go ahead with the text as it is, since the basic material on the writers has of course not changed, and the amount of bibliographical material to be added would not be great.

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Second, a certain amount of material translated outside of Bulgaria has escaped the notice of the Cyril and Methodius National Library of Sofia, which compiled the list of translations. The total amount of this material is quite small and is mostly in book form, so it can be found without difficulty in libraries by the interested Western reader.

Third, a list of translations of the works of Bulgarian authors not discussed in this volume has not been included, since this volume is intended to cover only the better-known Bulgarian writers. Slavica has begun work, in cooperation with the Cyril and Methodius National Library, on the compilation of a complete bibliography of Bulgarian literature and criticism in English (similar to the one that we have already published for Yugoslav literature). Publication is tentatively planned for 1985. Submissions of material are most welcome.

Finally, I would note that the first draft of this book included a number of critics among the authors discussed, but after considerable reflection it was agreed that the critics would not be included in the final version, primarily because it was felt that their presence would detract from the emphasis upon the writers themselves. This book is not intended to be a survey of all activities relating to literature in Bulgaria (in which case it would need material on journals, the institutes for literature of the Academy of Sciences, and much more), but only a survey of the most important Bulgarian writers and their works. For those who wish information on the critics, as well as more bibliography on the writers themselves, and information on writers not included here, we refer you to *Rechnik na bulgarska literatura (A Dictionary of Bulgarian Literature)*, published by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences in Sofia, 1976 ff. (two of the projected three volumes have appeared to date).

February 6, 1982
Columbus, Ohio

Charles E. Gribble
President, Slavica
Publishers, Inc.

TRANSLATOR'S FOREWORD

As with all translations from Slavic languages, one difficult problem is the transliteration system. This is especially so for Bulgarian, from which relatively few works have been translated into English. I have used a transliteration system which I feel most closely indicates the original Bulgarian. Its major weakness is that it fails to distinguish between Bulgarian short 'u' (ъ) and regular Bulgarian 'u,' but using diacritic marks would have cluttered a text intended partially for non-specialists. The failure to distinguish these two sounds will of course cause no problems for persons who know Bulgarian and wish to look up citations in Bulgarian. Since a slightly different system of transliteration is more widely used in Bulgaria itself, the reader will sometimes find differences in citations in other books; e.g., Khristo (Botev) here but Hristo elsewhere; Slaveykov here but Slaveikov elsewhere. The system which I have used should help the non-Bulgarian-speaking reader to pronounce the names more accurately.

The form of the work, bio-bibliographical sketches, also imposed certain difficulties. In the authors' attempts to give the most important information in the briefest form, they sometimes lapsed a bit from the smoothest possible prose. There was a certain roughness about the original that has unavoidably carried over into the translation in places. Since this work is intended above all for persons who are not specialists in Bulgarian literature, all titles have been transliterated each time they occur, and a translation has been given at the first occurrence. If subsequent occurrences are very far away from the first, the translation is repeated. In translating the titles of works and periodicals I often had to make a decision between literal or free translation. This was especially difficult for those words with two or more direct or implied meanings. As it was impossible to verify the authors' intent or to read all the works mentioned, I generally gave either a literal translation or the one I knew to be most used.

A few characteristic terms and important historical events are annotated throughout, e.g. "cell school[1]," "April Uprising[8]," etc. with the notes at the end of the work.

P.M.

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

TRANSLITERATION

Bulgarian	*English*	*Bulgarian*	*English*
А	A	П	P
Б	B	Р	R
В	V	С	S
Г	G	Т	T
Д	D	У	U
Е	E	Ф	F
Ж	ZH	Х	KH
З	Z	Ц	TS
И	I	Ч	CH
Й	Y	Ш	SH
К	K	Щ	SHT
Л	L	Ъ	U
М	M	Ь	'
Н	N	Ю	YU
О	O	Я	YA

Russian follows the same system except for:

Ы	Y	Щ	SHCH
		Ё	(Y)O
ъ	"	Э	E

Such other examples of Slavic languages in Cyrillic as occur in the text are rendered in accordance with the Bulgarian-Russian system above as appropriate. Words from Latin-alphabet Slavic languages are rendered without change.

NOTE ON THE AUTHORS

Prof. Mateja Matejić, Ph.D., is Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the Ohio State University in Columbus. He is also the founder and editor of Kosovo Publishing Co. of Columbus.

Elena Dimitrova, Krustyu Kuyumdzhiev, Docho Lekov, and Ivan Sarandev all hold the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences and are Senior Research Associates at the Institute of Literature of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia.

Karen Black, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Russian at Bates College in Lewiston, Maine.

Predrag Matejić, Doctor of Philological Sciences (Sofia), is at the Ohio State University in Columbus.

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

INTRODUCTION

Mateja Matejić

Of all the literatures written in Slavic languages, Bulgarian is the oldest. Its inception dates back to the ninth century and its uninterrupted traditions begin at the dawn of Slavic literacy.

The Bulgarian state came into existence as far back as the year 681, yet the beginning of Bulgarian literacy in its present form coincides with the reign of Boris-Michael (852-889). By that time the homogeneous national entity and identity was definitely formed from a heterogeneous population consisting of proto-Bulgarians, Slavs and descendants of Thracians. The adoption of a common language (Slavic) and a common religion (Christianity) for the entire nation greatly strengthened national unity.

The origin of Bulgarian literacy and literature is closely related to the Christianization of Bulgaria , and especially to the missionary work of two brothers, Kiril (Cyril) (827-869) and Methodius (815-885), and their disciples. Though their mission was undertaken in the territory of Moravia, in present-day Czechoslovakia, it had far-reaching consequences for the cultural history of Bulgaria.

Prior to their departure for Moravia, the two brothers and some of their disciples translated from Greek into Slavic manuscripts with the texts indispensable for the religious, liturgical and canonical needs of a Christian ecclesiastical community. Since at that time a Slavic alphabet did not exist, Kiril—a learned man and a very capable philologist—invented one. Today the majority of scholars believe that the alphabet invented by Kiril was the Glagolitic, which according to certain evidence is older than the Cyrillic. Nevertheless, a few scholars stubbornly insist that Kiril invented the Cyrillic rather than the Glagolitic alphabet.

The initial literary fund of Old Bulgarian literature, shared by other Slavs, was almost exclusively religious in content. It consisted of scriptural, liturgical and canonical manuscripts. Later it was enriched by additional translations of Byzantine hagiographies, offices,

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

encomia, sermons and other types of literature by outstanding Byzantine writers. Old Bulgarian and other Slavic literatures were thereby able to benefit from the literary masterpieces of Judeo-Christian culture.

The original Old Bulgarian literature also begins with Kiril and Methodius. Both of them, but especially Kiril, wrote original works in the Slavic language, and the latter's works provided the basis and the models for future Bulgarian authors.

Another event of crucial importance for the cultural history of the South Slavs, particularly the Bulgarians, was the expulsion of the disciples of Kiril and Methodius from Moravia after the death of Methodius in 885. Some of these disciples went to Bulgaria, where they received a warm welcome from Boris-Michael. The most important of those who came to Bulgaria were Kliment and Naum, both believed to have been of Bulgarian origin. With the consent and generous support of Boris-Michael, they undertook intensive religious and cultural activities.

Simeon (893-927), a son of Boris-Michael and educated in Constantinople, was deeply interested in spreading literacy and in making education and literature available to his subjects. Continuing the policies of his father, he encouraged the promotion of Bulgaria's religious, ecclesiastical, educational and literary interests.

The reign of Simeon is known as the Golden Period of Old Bulgarian literature. At that time two cultural centers emerged: one at Preslav, the capital of Bulgaria, and the other at Okhrid. The center at Preslav, headed by Naum, included Tsar Simeon, Grigoriy, Konstantin Preslavski, Ioan Exarch, Chernorizets Khrabur, Gavriil the Monk, Chernorizets Dokh and his son Tudor. The cultural center in Okhrid was founded and headed by Kliment, later appointed the first Bulgarian bishop.

The contributions of the two centers are represented primarily by translations of the works of John Chrysostomos (354-407), John Damascene († c. 770), Basil the Great (330-379), Athanasius of Alexandria (295-373), Andrew of Creta (660-740), Ephraim of Syria (529-545), and other outstanding Byzantine authors. The copying of the voluminous *Sborniki* (Miscellanea), containing a variety of literary materials put together selectively, dates from this period. Original Bulgarian literature was further enriched by the works of Kliment, Konstantin Preslavski, Ioan Exarch, Chernorizets Khrabur and others.

During the reign of Simeon's son Petur (927-969), the stability of Church and State was undermined by internal conflict and invasion from abroad. Furthermore, the plundering armies of the Russian Prince Svyatoslav devastated Bulgaria in 969, and Byzantine troops invaded it in 971. During this period few original works were written, and many manuscripts produced in the previous periods were destroyed. The outstanding writer of this time is Presbyter Kozma, who wrote a polemical homily against the Bogomils. Of the Bogomil writers, Presbyter Eremiya was the most productive, leaving several literary works of apocryphal content.

The official Church reacted vigorously against the Bogomils with persecution and suppression and with destruction of Bogomil literary works. In fact, most of the Bogomil literary documents were annihilated, and their existence is known only through references to them in anti-Bogomil documents.

The Byzantine invasion of Bulgaria induced a number of Bulgarian writers to emigrate to the unconquered territory of West Bulgaria where Samuil ruled until 1014, at which time this area too was captured by the Byzantines. Prevailing conditions during this period were not favorable to the fostering of cultural activities. Nevertheless, a number of literary documents of religious content were produced in both Glagolitic and Cyrillic alphabets, primarily in monasteries.

A new period in Old Bulgarian literature began after the liberation from Byzantine rule at the end of the twelfth century (1186). The much depleted literary fund, reduced through systematic destruction of Slavic manuscripts, had to be replenished, and that was the first task of the Bulgarian scribes and writers of this period. The reign of Asen II (1218-1241) was a particularly favorable epoch for such an endeavor. In addition to the cultural center at the Zograph Monastery on Mount Athos, new centers emerged in Turnovo, the new capital of Bulgaria, in the monasteries of St. Pantaleimon and St. Naum near Okhrid, in Rila Monastery and the Monastery of Bachkovo. The intellectual elite of that period are represented by Teodosiy Turnovski, Evtimiy Turnovski, Grigoriy Tsamblak, Konstantin Kostenichki, Kipriyan, Romil Bdinski, Ioasaf Bdinski and others.

Hagiographies of Slavic and Bulgarian saints which appeared in this period are a novelty and reflect the rise of national consciousness. Another new moment in

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

the development of Bulgarian literature was marked by the appearance of numerous *Miscellanea* which included not only canonical but apocryphal texts as well.

Also historically important are two documents from this period: "The Synodic of Tsar Boril," which contains condemnation of the heretics, including Bogomils, anathematized at the Council of Turnovo of 1211, and "The Zograph Story," an account of the Crusaders' attack on Mount Athos and the martyrdom of the monks of the Zograph Monastery.

The final period of Old Bulgarian literature encompasses several centuries—from 1396, when the Turks invaded Bulgaria, until 1762 and the writing of Paisiy's *Bulgaroslavic History*. During all that time the country was enslaved, but the national spirit of the Bulgarian people remained free. Even in this tragic and perilous period, Bulgarian scribes and writers continued their creativity. Scarce manuscripts, including liturgical ones, were copied in order to restore the impoverished literary stock, and original literary works were produced.

Despite an exodus of Bulgarian scribes and writers to other countries, literary activity in Bulgaria did not abate. In fact, this epoch is characterized by a large number of copies of literary works from previous periods.

The influx of Bulgarian writers and manuscripts into Russia after 1396 produced the Second South Slavic Influence on Russian literature. Later in this period a large number of Bulgarian manuscripts were taken once more to Romania, Serbia, Croatia and Mount Athos, and then from Mount Athos to Russia. For example, in 1645 Arseniy Sukhanov, a Russian monk, took four hundred codices from Mount Athos to Russia; many of them were Bulgarian.

Among the outstanding writers of this period who settled in other countries were Kipriyan Moskovski, Grigoriy Tsamblak, and Konstantin Kostenichki.

In Bulgaria literary activity was sustained through the efforts of scribes and writers in the monasteries of Rila, Mateyche, Dragalevtsi and Etropole. Most famous were Vladislav Gramatik and Dimitur Kantakuzen in the fifteenth century and Presbyter Peyo in the sixteenth. Following the trend established by Patriarch Evtimiy in the fourteenth century, these men wrote hagiographies of and offices for Bulgarian saints and martyrs, some of whom were common people tortured and executed by the Turks. Thus hagiographies, as well as some other works

of this period, were nationalistic in tendency though religious in content. By glorifying Bulgarian saints and martyrs they maintained and reinforced both the religious and the national awareness of Bulgarians enslaved by Turks.

An increased interest in the history of Bulgaria marked the dawn of a new era in Old Bulgarian literature. Several "chronicles," containing references to contemporary events, were compiled. The oldest, written by Presbyter Metodiy Draginov, gives a description of the compulsory Islamization of the inhabitants of Chepine in 1657. Another priest, Peter of Mirkovo, depicted the uprising of the population of Chiprovtsi. The third chronicle from this period, also by a priest, Grigor, includes an account of the massacres in the province of Rhodope. These works, reflecting an interest in national history, anticipated the forthcoming National Reawakening which began in 1762.

Among the forerunners of the National Reawakening are some Bulgarian Catholics, a minority originating from those Bogomils who had accepted Roman Catholicism, and also known as "Paulicians." Significant writers of this group were Petur Bogdan, Krustyu Peykich, and Pavel Gaydadzhinski-Dovanli. Their literary works, basically religious in content, showed nationalistic tendencies. Gaydadzhinski-Dovanli wrote a collection of hymns and poems in vernacular Bulgarian.

The pragmatic tendency of the literature of the period just before the National Reawakening is best reflected in the *Miscellanea* known as the *Damaskini*. These were compilations intended for the general reading public. They usually, though not always, included translations of hagiographies and sermons of the popular Greek writer Damaskin (†1580), a monk of the Studite Monastery. The widely varied material of these collections provided, among other things, practical advice for daily life. The best known compilers of such collections were Iosif Bradati, Nikifor Rilski, Yankul Relkovski, Roman Gabrovski, Todor Vrachanski, Teofan Rilski, Presbyter Puncho, and Todor Pirdopski.

Finally, some eighteenth-century Bulgarian writers who lived and produced outside Bulgaria should also be listed among the precursors of the National Reawakening. One of these, Khristifor Zhefarovich, spent some time among the Serbs in Austro-Hungary and died in Moscow in 1753. Another was Parteniye Pavlovich, a Suffragan

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Bishop of the Serbian Metropolitanate of Sremski Karlovci. These two, quite important in Serbian literature, are also claimed as Serbian writers.

The appearance of Paisiy's *Bulgaroslavic History* in 1762 is generally, if not unanimously, considered the chronological beginning of the Bulgarian National Reawakening and the end of the period of Old Bulgarian literature. Its importance for Bulgarian literature is comparable to that of Avvakum's *Autobiography* for Russian literature. Its concern with Bulgarian history renewed and intensified interest in the Bulgarian past, and it became a source of hope for the future of Bulgaria.

Emancipation, political and cultural, was the central idea and the highest ideal expressed in the literature of the period between 1762 and 1878. This literature contained a clear statement of rejection of Bulgarian assimilation, be it through Hellenization or Islamization. Literature of this epoch contributed greatly to the rise of national consciousness and patriotic sentiment, and it inspired the Bulgarian struggle for liberation.

Secular content also characterized the literature of the National Reawakening. This literature was wholly in the service of national interests. As a result of printed books, the first of which appeared in Bulgaria in the sixteenth century, and periodicals, literature reached a larger number of readers and influenced their thinking and attitudes. New genres and creative methods were also adopted.

New types of schools, replacing the traditional monastic ones, were instrumental in spreading not only literacy and education, but nationalism as well. In addition to the monastic cultural centers of Rila, Zograph, and for some time Hilandar, secular centers were formed in each of the major Bulgarian cities—Sofia, Plovdiv, Turnovo, Ruse, and Gabrovo. Owing to the fact that there were Bulgarian communities abroad, important cultural centers existed also in Constantinople, Smyrna, Odessa, Salonika, Bucharest, Brăila, Budapest, Belgrade, Novi Sad, and many other cities.

At this time many Bulgarians were educated abroad, thus coming into contact with new ideas. On the other hand, they were able to inform the world of conditions in Bulgaria. Russia, Greece, Romania and Serbia offered their hospitality to Bulgarian students and revolutionaries, some of whom were scholars and writers.

The end of the Bulgarian isolation imposed by the Turkish enslavement was also marked by an increased number of translations of foreign literature in Bulgaria, and of Bulgarian literature abroad. This too contributed to the expansion of cultural horizons in Bulgaria and the acquaintance of foreign countries with Bulgarian history and literature.

A struggle for a literary language based upon the Bulgarian vernacular also took place during this period. Previously, authors had written in the language of the Church, occasionally using individual words from the vernacular. The disparity between the spoken and the written language was noticeable, and there was a definite need to adopt the vernacular as the literary language in order to bring literature closer to the people.

The first writers in the period of the National Reawakening—Paisiy Hilendarski, Sofroniy Vrachanski, Ioakim Karchovski, Kiril Peychinovich, and others—adopted the vernacular in their writing and even emphasized explicitly that they were writing "in simple Bulgarian for the common Bulgarians." This innovation encountered opposition and prompted some heated discussion, but eventually the Eastern Bulgarian dialect was accepted as the common literary language.

The evolution of literary genres in the Bulgarian literature of this period was reflected in a predilection for epic songs, patriotic lyrics, didactic poetry, and historic and moralistic prose. Drama and literary criticism also made their appearance at this time. Unlike Old Bulgarian literature, the literature of this period (particularly in its later phase) was not predominantly religious in character or in scope. Its content was emphatically secular, principally historic, patriotic, and pragmatic. Rather than religious preoccupations, man, or more correctly the nation, was the focus.

Another new feature of this period was the emergence of Bulgarian periodicals. The first were *Ljuboslovie* (Love for Literature), 1844-1846, published by K. Fotinov in Smyrna, and *Tsarigradski vestnik* (The Herald of Constantinople), 1848-1862, printed in Constantinople. Journalism became a very important weapon in the struggle for political and cultural emancipation of Bulgarians, and many outstanding Bulgarian writers edited or contributed to Bulgarian journals.

It was natural for a literature as patriotic as Bulgarian to concern itself with the life of its people.

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

This led to an increased interest in Bulgarian folklore. Many Bulgarian writers collected and studied folk elements and included them in their own works, imitating folk style, themes, and motifs.

Original poetry, characterized by emotional abandon, romantic enthusiasm, and patriotic exuberance, was the favorite genre. It was cultivated by Nayden Gerov, Dobri Chintulov, Georgi Rakovski, Petko R. Slaveykov, and Rayko Zhinzifov. It reached its esthetic maturity and excellence in the poetry of Khristo Botev, and later its supreme perfection in that of Ivan Vazov.

Russian prose, Karamzin's in particular, and German, as represented by Kristof von Schmidt, provided literary models for the emerging Bulgarian secular prose. Among its pioneers were Vasil Popovich, Iliya Bluskov, and Vasil Drumev, but the most significant was Lyuben Karavelov, whose literary works enjoyed a great popularity. Their patriotic, polemical, and satirical content appealed to the reading public.

Bulgarian drama also appeared in this period. Dobri Voynikov's patriotic plays, based on historical and pesudo-historical subjects, marked its beginning. No less significant a contributor to Bulgarian drama of the period was Vasil Drumev, whose *Ivanko ubietsut na Aseniya I* (Ivanko, the Assassin of Asen I), which appeared in 1872, is still popular and is repeatedly staged in Bulgaria.

The year 1878 brought the much-longed-for liberation of Bulgaria, an event which had its impact on literature as well. The first decade after liberation was characterized by glorification of the heroism and sacrifices which led to it. A jubilant intoxication with freedom, unknown for centuries, inspired hymns to liberty and odes to the domestic warriors and their Russian allies. A genuine love and gratitude towards the Russian soldiers who fought to free their Bulgarian brothers from the oppressive rule of Turks, permeated emotionally exalted, if not always qualitatively mature, lyrics. Several writers who had been active in the previous period continued their literary creativity after the liberation. Ivan Vazov, the patriarch of Bulgarian literature, reached the peak of his artistic glory and produced many works of lasting value during this period as well as in the period which followed.

Soon after the initial phase of post-liberation exuberance, a somber awakening ensued, followed in turn

by the skepticism and disenchantment caused by a not-so-attractive internal situation. The suspension of the Constitution by Prince Alexander in 1881 was felt as an infringement upon the freedom of the nation. Bulgaria was divided into two parts, the Bulgarian Princedom and Eastern Rumelia. For the Bulgarians, this division was a much deplored reality, and they struggled for the reunification of their country. This was eventually achieved in the year 1885. Unfortunately in the same year a war between the Serbs and the Bulgarians took place. All these events affected the mood and themes of the period's literature. Discontent was voiced implicitly and explicitly in these works. The abdication of Prince Alexander in 1886 brought some relief and a more tolerable atmosphere, yet the unpopular policies of the new ruler, Prince Ferdinand, alienated many writers.

Despite unfavorable social conditions, Bulgarian literature made significant progress during this time. The works of Ivan Vazov, Aleko Konstantinov, Konstantin Velichkov, Zakhari Stoyanov, Todor Vlaykov, Mikhalaki Georgiev, Stoyan Mikhaylovski, Anton Strashimirov and Tsanko Tserkovski, to mention the most prominent, provide ample evidence of that progress.

Bulgarian literature in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth underwent a considerable change and polarization. Romantic exuberance and patriotic exaltation were replaced by critical observation, realistic depiction, and social protest on the one hand, and by escape into modernism and individualism on the other. Esthetically the literature of this period was rapidly maturing, outgrowing provincialism, and becoming concerned with more universal problems without abandoning Bulgarian settings and characters. Actuality and man with his internal and external conflicts came into the focus of literature. Idealization, characteristic of the previous epoch, gave place to the realistic and critical assessment of actuality. This inevitably led toward socially oriented literary works, satire, and exposure of corruption on an individual and a social level. Patriotism was expressed through criticism rather than through panegyric. Legendary heroes, warriors, and martyrs were replaced in realistically oriented literature with anti-heroes of a negative character. Interest in the past was forsaken and replaced by concern for the present. Preoccupation with the nation was decreasing; interest in social

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

plights and individual problems was increasing. Not the glory of the past, but the misery of the present attracted the attention of writers. When the historic past was the theme of a literary work—as it was in Vazov's *Epopeya na zabravenite* (The Epic of the Forgotten Ones) and Pencho Slaveykov's *Kurvava pesen* (Song of Blood)—the proud and doleful tones resounded again. However, these poems were principally a reproach to individuals and to a whole nation which had forgotten its glorious past, its heroic tasks, and its debt to those who had died for its freedom.

Continuous and rather animated literary polemics in this period reflected ideological and esthetic differences among the writers. Those who considered the purpose of literature to be concern with the nation's social and cultural needs clashed with others who contended that art has no other goal but itself. However, it would be untrue to claim that the lines were never crossed, or that the proponents of each position remained firmly entrenched in their attitudes.

Ideological differences were also reflected in selection of themes and motifs, and in the variety of artistic methods applied. Especially characteristic of the new generation of writers was a conscious search for originality, broadened cultural horizons, a preoccupation with individual psychology, a pessimistic approach to reality, and an almost obsessive concern with sorrow, night, and death.

New periodicals were mushrooming, facilitating the wider reach of literature. Literary centers existed in a number of provincial cities, the chief one in Sofia. Literary criticism became a serious factor in promoting the qualitative improvement of Bulgarian literature. Theoretical and applied literary criticism, especially that of Dr. Krustyu Krustev, K. Velichkov, D. Blagoev, B. Penev, M. Arnaudov and a few other less prominent but also influential critics, contributed substantially to the rising esthetic and ideological level of literature. Especially important was the periodical *Misul* (Thought), 1892-1907, edited by Dr. Krustyu Krustev. Several of the most influential writers were contributors, among them Stoyan Mikhaylovski, Pencho R. Slaveykov, Peyo Yavorov, and Petko Todorov. Mara Belcheva, the first notable Bulgarian woman poet, was also associated with that journal.

The opposite pole of the position held by the writers who applied realistic methods and insisted on realism in literature was represented by the group of

symbolist writers. Unconcerned with social realities, they were preoccupied with an abstract art focused on introspection, dreams, and imaginary and real inner conflicts. Their works show anxiety, fascination with psychology, and a predilection for the obscure, the mysterious, and the mystical. State of mind rather than man's total actuality was central in their art. Pessimism was characteristic of their poetry, and their concept of human nature was apparently Pelagian, suggesting that it is hopelessly corrupt and incurably sick.

The influence of French, German and Russian symbolists, particularly Mallarmé, Verlaine, Dehmel, George, Bal'mont, Blok and Bryusov on Bulgarian symbolists is indisputable. Nevertheless, they did produce original works and contribute to symbolist theory of art. Their works were published in the journals *Vezni* (The Scales), 1919-1922; *Zlatorog* (The Golden Horn), 1920-1943; *Hyperion,* 1922-1931, and *Nash zhivot* (Our Life), 1901-1907 and 1911-1912.

A conscious search for originality, a significant expension of poetic language, the enrichment and improvement of literary forms, especially poetic ones, and the use of new poetic methods and literary devices were the most significant achievements of symbolist art. Outstanding among symbolist writers, many of whom later defected from symbolism and became pioneers of socialist literature, are Teodor Trayanov, Khristo Yasenov, Lyudmil Stoyanov, Dimcho Debelyanov, Geo Milev, Nikolay Raynov, Nikolay Liliev and Emanuel Popdimitrov.

Apart from the writers who depended on realism or symbolism, alone in his greatness and faithful to a literary tradition which he began, Ivan Vazov continued to create works of lasting value.

Finally, the poetry of Kiril Khristov, the prose of Anton Strashimirov, and the bitter satire of Georgi Stamatov occupy a special place in the literature of this period.

In the relatively short span of time between 1912 and 1944, Bulgaria participated in three wars—in 1913, 1915, and 1941—and its historical and cultural development was deeply affected by three coups—one organized by the rightists on June 9, 1923; one attempted by the Communists in September of 1923; and finally the one which led to the takeover of political power by the Communists, accomplished on September 9, 1944.

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

The plight which World War I created for the Bulgarian people was augmented and aggravated by political instability, by individual and collective insecurity, and by the violence and oppression which characterized the post-World War I epoch. The persecution of political opponents by the regime in power was particularly unscrupulous in 1925, and it reached its peak between February and April of that year, when many persons, including some talented writers, were the victims of terror and executions.

Despite such an atmosphere of political instability, violence, and loss of human rights and life, literary productivity was rather high in the period between the two wars, 1915-1944. War reminiscences, human suffering, victories and defeats provided ample material as well as inspiration for literary works just after World War I. A psychological and artistic reaction to war cruelties and postwar miseries led some writers to an escape from realism into an abstract and predominantly modernistic art. It was the time of experimenting with poetic forms and fascination with the current non-realistic and anti-realistic trends cultivated in Europe.

At least a segment of the Bulgarian literature of that period, and especially the poetry, was characterized by an anxious verbalism which could not alleviate a deep unease or conceal the unhappiness experienced by writers. To some of them the word, rather than the world, was, if not the only, then at least the principal reality.

Diametrically opposite to abstract literature was socialist literature, which emerged in this period. Ideologically inspired, realistically oriented, and socially committed, this literature became an important factor in the history and culture of Bulgaria. It was created primarily by the writers who either were members of the Bulgarian Communist Party or who sympathized with it, but it also attracted many politically uncommitted writers, some of them former symbolists and modernists. This type of literature appeared in a number of literary journals, of which the most important were *Plamuk* (Flame), *Nov put* (The New Road), and the humor journal *Cherven smyakh* (Red Laughter).

Soviet poetry, especially Mayakovskiy's, had an obvious influence on some Bulgarian poets, who, however, were not merely his imitators, but his peers. A precious poetic heritage was left by some poets of this period, among them Geo Milev, Khristo Smirnenski, Nikola Vap-

tsarov, Asen Raztsvetnikov, Nikola Furnadzhiev, Nikola Rakitin, Emanuel Popdimitrov, Khristo Radevski, Lyudmil Stoyanov, Lamar (Lalyu Ponchev Marinov), Atanas Dalchev, Mladen Isaev, D. Panteleev, N. Marangozov, and Nikolay Khrelkov. Two great women poets, Dora Gabe and Elisaveta Bagryana, also made a significant contribution to the poetry of this epoch.

There were also notable achievements in prose. In the brilliant short stories of Elin Pelin and Yordan Yovkov, that genre reached its climax. Other prominent prose writers were Georgi Raychev, Nikolay Raynov, Konstantin Petkanov, Konstantin Konstantinov, Iliya Volen, Vladimir Polyanov, Svetoslav Minkov, Angel Karaliychev, Orlin Vasilev, and many others too numerous to mention here. The historical novels of Stoyan Zagorchinov and Fani Popova-Mutafova achieved an unprecedented prominence and established a literary tradition still maintained. The best humorous prose was written by Chudomir; quite popular were the comedies of Stefan Kostov. Finally, the best socially oriented and ideologically consistent prose was that of Georgi Karaslavov.

The most recent period of contemporary Bulgarian literature, beginning September 9, 1944, is characterized by an unprecedented productivity, a wide variety of genres, and achievements of remarkably high quality. The fact that literary creativity was never before so generously supported, so enthusiastically promoted, and so greatly appreciated, may account for such a high degree of productivity. The number of literary works appearing, as well as the number of printed copies of published works, are the highest ever, yet copies are sold as soon as they appear on the market. Reading and discussing literature is not the privilege of a narrow circle of scholars and critics, but a common practice of almost every literate person. Every city and nearly every village has its own library. Radio and television also provide means of propagating literature and art. Theaters exist not only in Sofia and other major cities, but in many small towns as well. Cultural activities are high on the list of priorities in modern Bulgarian society. In general, the quantity of published literary works is remarkable, and the same may be said for their quality.

Many writers from the previous period, both poets and prose writers, are still alive and quite productive. Outstanding among them are undoubtedly Dora Gabe, Georgi

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Karaslavov and Elisaveta Bagryana. All three, greatly admired and deeply loved by Bulgarian readers, continue to create and publish masterpieces in prose and poetry. Their works are being translated into many languages and being considered for highest honors not only in Bulgarian, but also in world literature.

Among the members of the "older generation" who continued to create after September 9, 1944, are the prominent poets Lyudmil Stoyanov, Khristo Radevski, Nikolay Khrelkov, Mladen Isaev, Atanas Dalchev, Nikola Furnadzhiev, Dimitur Panteleev, and N. Marangozov. The still active prose writers from this generation are Stoyan Zagorchinov, Angel Karaliychev, Orlin Vasilev, Svetoslav Minkov, Iliya Volen, and many others.

The number of representatives from a younger generation, appearing in Bulgarian literature after September 9, 1944, is rather large. Outstanding among them are the poets V. Andreev, V. Petrov, V. Khanchev, B. Bozhilov, A. Gerov, I. Peychev, Blaga Dimitrova, R. Ralin, I. Radoev, P. Penev, P. Matev, G. Dzhagarov, D. Metodiev, L. Levchev, L. Mikhaylova, O. Orlin, V. Bashev, D. Damyanov, P. Stefanov, and others too numerous to list. Of the prose writers of this generation one has to mention D. Talev, D. Dimov, E. Stanev, P. Vezhinov, A. Gulyashki, K. Kalchev, B. Raynov, I. Petrov, S. C. Daskalov, N. Khaytov, A. Donchev, Y. Radichkov and G. Stoev. Of course, this is an incomplete list, mentioning only the most prominent writers of this post-September literary generation.

Bulgarian drama has also showed some excellent achievements since September 9, 1944. Major contributors in this genre are O. Vasilev, K. Zidarov, G. Karaslavov, L. Strelkov, T. Genov, G. Dzhagarov, I. Peychev, I. Radoev, D. Asenov, E. Manov, V. Petrov, N. Rusev, N. Yordanov, and many others.

Finally, significant progress in Bulgarian literary criticism in this period should also be mentioned. Productivity and excellence in this area are best represented by the works of M. Arnaudov, T. Pavlov, P. Zarev, P. Dinekov, G. Tsanev, P. Danchev, S. Karolev, P. Pondev, S. Khadzhikosev, and Ch. Dobrev.

These names mean little to anyone who is not familiar with the works of these writers. However, the scope and aim of this Introduction do not permit an analysis of those works. Besides, it is too early to attempt an elaborate and conclusive evaluation of contemporary Bul-

garian literature, although it is already evident that the present period is a very significant one for the history and development of Bulgarian literature, and that a considerable number of recent literary works represent valuable contributions and lasting achievements.

General Bibliographies:

Andreeva, S., and Stanisheva, Lazarina K. *Bibliografiya na slavyanskoto literaturoznanie i folklor v Bulgariya: 1916-1965*. S.: Nauka i izkustvo, 1968.

Arnaudov, Mikhail. *Bulgarski pisateli: Zhivot, tvorchestvo, idei. Literaturno-istoricheska bibliografiya*. 6 vols. S.: Fakel, 1929-30.

Bogdanov, Ivan. *Bulgarskata literatura v dati i kharakteristiki*. S.: Narodna prosveta, 1966.

———. *Bulgarska literaturna periodika: Prinosut na periodichniya pechat i razvitieto na Bulgarskata literatura*. S.: Otechestveniya front, 1972.

Dyugmadzhieva, P.; Karadzhova, A.; and Angelov, S. *Suvremenni bulgarski pisateli: Preporuchitelna bibliografiya*. S.: Narodna biblioteka "Kiril i Metodiy," 1972.

Konstantinov, Georgi. *Bulgarski pisateli: Biografski i bibliografski danni*. S.: Khemus, 1947.

Konstantinov, Georgi; Minkov, Ts.; and Velkov, S. *Bulgarski pisateli: Biografna bibliografiya*. S.: Bulgarski pisatel, 1961.

Popiliev, Todor. *Bulgarska khudozhestvena literatura i kritika*. S.: Nauka i izkustvo, 1957.

Traykov, Veselin. *Bulgariya v chuzhdata literatura, 1954-1963*. S.: Narodna biblioteka "Kiril i Metodiy," 1965.

———. *Bulgarskata khudozhestvena literatura na chuzhdi ezitsi: Bibliografski ukazatel: 1823-1962*. S.: Nauka i izkustvo.

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Umikiyan, A., and Sor, V. *Bolgarskaya literatura: Bibliografski ukazatel'*. M., 1948.

Critical Studies (Old Bulgarian Literature):

Aizetmüller, R. *Das Hexameron des Exarchen Johannes*. 4 vols. Graz, 1958-1968.

Angelov, B. St. *Iz starata bulgarska, ruska i surbska literatura*. Vol. 1. S., 1958. Vol. 2. S., 1967.

Angelov, D. *Bogomilstvo v Bulgariya*. S., 1969.

Begunov, Yu. K. *Kozma Prezviter v slavyanskikh literaturakh*. S.: BAN, 1973.

Danchev, G. *Vladislav Gramatik: Knizhovnik i pisatel*. S., 1969.

Dinekov, P. *Stara bulgarska literatura*. Vol. 1. S., 1950. Vol. 2. S., 1953.

Dinekov, P.; Petkanova, D.; and Kuev, K. *Khrestomatiya po starobulgarska literatura*. S., 1967.

Dragova, N. *Kliment Okhridski*. S., 1966.

Duychev, I. *Iz starata bulgarska knizhnina*. Vol. 1. S., 1940. Vol. 2. S., 1944.

Georgiev, E. *Kiril i Metodij: Osnovnopolozhnitsi na slavyanskite literaturi*. S., 1956.

———. *Literatura na izostreni borbi v srednevekovna Bulgariya*. S.: BAN, 1966.

———. *Raztsvet na bulgarskata literatura v IX-X v.* S., 1962.

Il'inskiy, T. *Opyt sistematicheskoy Kirillo-Metodievskoy bibliografii*. S., 1934.

Ivanova-Mircheva, D., ed. *Ioan Ekzarkh Bulgarski: Slova*. Vol. 1. S.: BAN, 1971.

Ivanov, Y. *Bogomilski knigi i legendi*. S.: Nauka i izkustvo, 1970.

———. *Bulgarski starini iz Makedoniya*. S.: Nauka i izkustvo, 1931.

Yatsmirski, A.I. *Grigoriy Tsamblak*. SPb., 1904.

Kaluzhnatski, E. *Aus der panegyrischen Literatur der Südslaven*. Vienna, 1901.

———. *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius*. Vienna, 1901.

Kiselkov, V. St. *Patriarkh Evtimiy*. S., 1938.

———. *Prouki i ocherki po starobulgarska literatura*. S.: BAN, 1956.

Kliment Okhridski: Materiali za negovoto chestvuvane po sluchay 1050 godini ot smurtta mu. S.: BAN, 1968.

Kliment Okhridski: Sbornik ot statii po sluchay 1050 godini ot smurtta mu. S.: BAN, 1966.

Kliment Okhridski: Subrani suchineniya. Vol. 1. S.: BAN, 1970. Vol. 2. S.: BAN, 1977. Vol. 3. S.: BAN, 1973.

Konstantin-Kiril Filosof: Dokladi ot simpoziuma posveten na 1100-godishninata ot smurtta mu. S.: BAN, 1971.

Konstantin-Kiril Filosof: Yubileen sbornik po sluchay 1100-godishninata ot smurtta mu. S.: BAN, 1969.

Kuev, K. *Azbuchnata molitva*. S.: BAN, 1974.

———. *Chernorizets Khrabur*. S.: BAN, 1967.

Legreid, A. *Der Rethorische Stil in Šestodnev des Exarchen Johannes*. Wiesbaden, 1965.

Mechev, K. *Grigorij Tsamblak*. S., 1969.

Petkanova-Toteva, D. *Damaskinite v Bulgarskata literatura*. S., 1966.

———. *Vuprosi na starobulgarskata literatura*. S., 1966.

Popruzhenko, M. *Kozma Prezviter: Bolgarski pisatel' X veka*. S.: BAN, 1936.

Radchenko, K. *Religioznoe i literaturnoe dvizhenie v Bolgarii v epokhu pered turetskim zavoevaniem*. Kiev, 1898.

Romanska-Vranska, Tsv. *Stilni pokhvati na patriarkh Evtimiy*. S., 1942.

Rusev, P., et al., eds. *Grigoriy Tsamblak v rumunska literatura*. S.: BAN, 1966.

LIBRARY U. OF I. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

———. *Pokhvalno slovo za Evtimiy ot Grigoriy Tsamblak.* S.: BAN, 1971.

Syrku, P. *K istorii ispravleniya knig v Bolgarii.* Vol. 1. SPb., 1898. Vol. 2. SPb., 1890.

———. *Ocherki iz istorii literaturnykh snosheniy Bolgarov i Serbov v XIV-XVII vekakh.* SPb., 1901.

Teodorov-Balan, A. *Kiril i Metodiy.* Vol. 1. S., 1920. Vol. 2. S., 1934.

Turzhestvena sesiya za 1100 godishninata na slavyanska pismenost 863-1963. S.: BAN, 1965.

Undolskiy, V.M. *Kliment episkop slovenskiy.* M., 1895.

Khilyada i sto godini slavyanska pismenost: 863-1963. S.: BAN, 1963.